DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 279 CG 032 238

AUTHOR Choudhuri, Dibya

TITLE Diversity Issues in the Clinical Supervision of Counseling Practicum Students: A Thematic Analysis.

PUB DATE 2002-00-00
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Counselor Supervision; Counselor Training; *Cultural Pluralism; Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Practicum Supervision; *Supervisor Supervisee Relationship; *Supervisory Methods

ABSTRACT

A discovery-based approach was used to examine the ways in which diversity issues are addressed in supervision by analyzing the content of actual clinical supervision sessions with Master's students during their counseling practicum. The themes that emerged described patterns of interaction, starting with the initiation of diversity issues by the supervisor. Supervisee response to such reference could be organized into four themes, and the resulting pattern of interaction could also be characterized across the supervision process in four ways. Different areas of social identity appeared to be dealt with differently, with race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation appearing to be more risky. (Contains 26 references.) (Author)

Diversity Issues in the Clinical Supervision of Counseling Practicum students: A Thematic Analysis

Dibya Choudhuri, Ph.D.
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, MI

Correspondence regarding this paper can be directed to Dibya Choudhuri, 304 Porter Building, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI 48197 or email at dibya.choudhuri@emich.edu.

Diversity Issues in the Clinical Supervision of Counseling Practicum students: A Thematic Analysis

Abstract

A discovery-based approach was used to examine the ways in which diversity issues are addressed in supervision by analyzing the content of actual clinical supervision sessions with Master's students during their counseling practicum. The themes that emerged described patterns of interaction, starting with the initiation of diversity issues by the supervisor. Supervisee response to such reference could be organized into four themes, and the resulting pattern of interaction could also be characterized across the supervision process in four ways. Different areas of social identity appeared to be dealt with differently, with race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation appearing to be more risky.

Key Words: Clinical Supervision, diversity, multicultural, counseling, practicum experience

Diversity Issues in the Clinical Supervision of Counseling Practicum students: A Thematic Analysis

Introduction

The flourishing diversity of the population and the expanding awareness of disparate client needs have highlighted the necessity of finding a place for issues of diversity in counseling (Arredondo, 1998). The American Counseling Association (ACA), in its Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice (1995), includes in the Preamble, the statement that, "Association members recognize diversity in our society and embrace a cross-cultural approach in support of the worth, dignity, potential, and uniqueness of each individual" (p.28) To bring about this goal, counselor training programs must actively encourage and promote these concepts. Supervision is a key part of counselor education and preparation, wherein counselors-in-training begin to work with client populations while overseen by an experienced counselor (Russell & Petrie, 1994).. One of the reasons cited by Newman (1981) for the importance of supervision is that it serves as one of the primary training modes for teaching skills in counseling.

In 1993, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) developed a set of ethical guidelines for counseling supervisors to assist professionals in this field to "meet the training and development needs of supervisees in ways consistent with client welfare and programmatic requirements." (ACES, 1995, p.270). In the ACA Code of Ethics section on Teaching, Training, and Supervision, counselor educators are asked to make an effort to infuse material related to human diversity into all courses designed to promote counselor professional development (ACA, 1995, in Herlihy & Corey, 1995), and the ACES

ethical guidelines encourage supervisors to provide experiences that integrate theoretical knowledge and practical application (ACES, 1995). However, neither ACA or ACES specifically mentions the issue of diversity and multiculturalism in supervision. The National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC) recently generated a format to credential clinical supervisors, and developed a set of standards for the ethical practice of clinical supervision that include the need to "engage supervisees in an examination of cultural issues that might affect supervision and/or counseling" (NBCC, 1998).

On the one hand, knowledge and competency of issues of multiculturalism and diversity are considered necessary for counselors, yet little attention has been given to the process by which these issues may be addressed in supervision. Given the importance of supervision in the training and practice of counselors, it is striking that there are few guidelines in the professional codes for supervisors on incorporating multicultural modes of supervision. This gap is also echoed in the literature on the subject. Much of the knowledge regarding multicultural supervision is based on theory rather than research (Leong & Wagner, 1994). The content of multicultural supervision, its development, the supervision process, the role of the supervisor, and the resulting competency of the supervisee are all elements that are relatively untested and enigmatic. As pointed out by many (Bernard, 1994; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Fukuyama, 1994), in the last three decades, few empirical studies have been conducted in this area. Considering the burgeoning interest in multicultural issues in counseling, it is surprising that there is so little literature on multicultural supervision in recent years. Most articles have been theoretical (Fong, 1994; D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Gonzalez, 1997; Lopez, 1997; Stone, 1997), with little empirical research on the topic (Cook

and Helms, 1988; Fukuyama, 1994; Priest, 1994; Hilton, Russell & Salmi, 1995), even though many calls were made for further research.

Priest (1994) declared that it was incumbent on the field of counseling in general, and the subspecialization of supervision in particular, to formulate an efficacious model of multicultural supervision. To develop such models, theorists appear to have gone in one of two directions. Some have taken a general model of supervision and added attention to multicultural issues in each stage or level of the theory (for e.g. Cook, 1994), while others have borrowed from the racial identity models and awareness building theories of multicultural counseling and incorporated a supervisory dimension (such as Vasquez and McKinley, 1982).

In responding to some of the literature, Bernard (1994), identified key issues in this field of multicultural supervision. The focus on discussing Black-White relationships in counseling to the relative exclusion of more comprehensive models was a major issue. In addition, she points out that the literature often fuses the functions of training and supervision. Within the typical supervision experience, there is unlikely to be enough time to bring a supervisee from multicultural unawareness to therapeutic competence, and therefore it may be necessary to remove some of the burden for this training from the specific supervisory experience. Supervisees should have some multicultural training in coursework prior to the supervision experience. Conversely, given the importance of these issues, supervisors untrained in multicultural issues should not be deemed competent to supervise since multicultural issues are ubiquitous in every arena of counseling. For instance, taking the differential power relationship of supervision into account, a supervisor

who is in a beginning stage of multicultural awareness is unlikely to facilitate multicultural awareness in a trainee (Bernard, 1997).

Given the above prescriptions, it is clear that the field is large on prescriptive theory and short on data. In the general clinical supervision field, fifteen years ago, Holloway and Hosford (1983) declared that research on supervision should focus on descriptive studies first before moving to theory-driven research. That is largely what occurred (Goodyear & Bernard, 1998) and has been helpful in setting the stage for developing empirically-models of supervision. In a similar vein, it may be necessary to first develop a notion of what actually occurs in terms of multicultural issues in supervision before generating efficacy studies on what might be the best approach. A qualitative methodology might be the best route to generating rich description of the supervision process. For instance, through a survey of critical incidents in supervision, Fukuyama (1994) took a phenomenological approach to eliciting information on cross-cultural supervision, examining meaningful emotional and behavioral interpersonal experiences that made an impact on the supervisee's effectiveness. This research project takes a similar discovery stance, and examines the ways in which such issues are present in the supervision of Practicum students in counselor education. While much of the literature has focused primarily on issues of race and ethnicity, this study also attends to aspects of social identity such as gender, religion, socioeconomic class, disability, and sexual orientation. The ways in which diversity issues get introduced, addressed, and attended to in supervision, and the patterns that may be created between the supervisor and supervisee over the course of the supervisory relationship are the focus of this study. Given the relatively unexplored territory of multicultural

supervision, this study was designed qualitatively to explore the themes that arose in the supervisory process.

Methods

Participants

The pool of research participants were the students in the Master's program in Counselor Education undergoing their off-campus Practicum counseling experience and their Clinical Supervisors at a mid-size private northeastern university.

Supervisees. All the trainee participants had a minimum of three completed graduate courses in counseling theory, skills, and introduction to fieldwork. All were concurrently taking a course in multicultural counseling in addition to their Practicum. It is also important to note that all trainees were located on school sites, which shaped the kind of client issues, discussions, and counseling strategies presented. Part of their programmatic requirements were to have a weekly supervision meeting with an on-campus clinical supervisor.

Supervisors. The six on-campus clinical supervisors to whom these students were assigned were doctoral students in the Counselor Education and Supervision program, who were in their second and third years. Five were concurrently taking a doctoral seminar in supervision, while one had already done so. Four of the six were also taking a course in advanced multicultural counseling. All had some training in multicultural counseling issues. Since the principal researcher was one of the supervisors, and had been in courses with most of the others, all of the supervisors were aware of the nature and focus of the project.

Supervision pairs. While twelve trainees originally consented to participate in the research, due to various circumstances described later, only the data from eight were finally used in this study. The participants were chosen based primarily on the willingness of the clinical supervisors to participate and the consent of their supervisee. Supervision pairings was determined by the supervision course instructor, unaffiliated with the research study, and based on constraints of schedules and availability of participants.

The various pairings were rich in diversity. In all, there were finally 8 pairings of: African American female supervisor and African American female supervisee; African American female supervisor and European American female supervisee; Asian Indian female supervisor and Taiwanese female supervisee; Asian Indian female supervisor and European American female supervisees; European American male supervisor and European American male supervisee; European American male supervisor and European American female supervisee, and European American female supervisors and European American female supervisees. However, a crucial limitation is that no men of African, Asian, Latino or Native American heritage were available to be supervisors or supervisees. While the ages of the supervisees were between 22 and 32 years of age, the supervisors ranged from 26 to 51 years in age. Religion of participants was primarily some denomination of Christianity though there were three participants who declared themselves to be Jewish, Buddhist, and Agnostic. There were three participants who indicated having a disability, primarily visual in nature. None of the participants openly stated their sexual orientation, and from the data it appears that most would consider themselves heterosexual.

Procedures

The research project was explained to supervisees as an investigation into the processes of supervision. Diversity issues were not emphasized to prevent supervisees from being overly conscious of such issues, though supervisors were aware of the research focus. If both supervisor and supervisee agreed to participate, the supervisor was asked to audiotape a minimum of three supervision sessions at the beginning, middle, and endpoints of the supervision process. The supervision took place once a week, over a course of fifteen weeks which was the length of one academic semester. All tapes were collected from the supervisors at the end of the semester, and transcribing and analysis was begun after the semester ended.

Data Collection

The audiotapes were the primary data source to examine the ways in which multicultural issues were addressed as well as the progression of the supervision relationship over the course of the semester. In addition, each supervisor and supervisee completed a brief questionnaire on demographic details, prior supervision experience, as well as prior counseling experience at the preliminary stage.

Ultimately only eight out of the 12 supervision pairs who originally consented were used. In one case, the original commitment of taping was not followed through, while in two cases, the quality of the audiotaped recording of the sessions submitted was inadequate for analysis. In the fourth case, the supervision pairing had to be dropped because the supervisee withdrew consent after the data was collected. This last pairing is probably the one that may have yielded rich data of a supervision relationship which was problematic.

Analysis

The submitted tapes of supervision sessions (8 supervision pairs x 3 sessions = 24 tapes) ranging from 40 minutes to an hour and a quarter were listened to, and were transcribed and analyzed for diversity content. Diversity content was defined as any reference regarding an area of social identity such as ethnicity, culture, gender, disability, sexual orientation, religion, or class in terms of clients, themselves, or in theory. The issue of gender was marked when any reference was made that went beyond the simple use of a gendered name. When a reference was discovered, the context of the reference in terms of the preceding discussion as well as ensuing conversation was examined. In addition, references to the supervision relationship or to the supervisee's professional development or competency were also considered. The supervision time line was also a part of the analysis to frame the discussions in the context of when in the supervision process they took place.

Once references were collected, they were coded through two successive procedures. Open coding (Strauss, 1987) consisted of assigning names to observations. Preliminary observations focused on who initiated or raised issues of diversity, in what context, and with what response. In the second stage, axial coding led to the formation of code categories, where various observations were grouped according to commonality. These categories were named according to the perceived nature of the discussion. While these categories were based on session content, they were then linked to process factors and subsequent discovery of patterns of interaction. These patterns were then analyzed and collapsed into further thematic categories.

In the final stage, the above categories were re-analyzed with a view to disconfirm the findings. The transcripts were studied again to distinguish material that either did not fit

in any of the established categories or failed to match up in a new one. Due to this, a category was established that held only one case, since no match could be developed with already constructed categories without stretching the data.

Results

The themes that emerged described patterns of interaction, starting with the initiation of diversity issues by the supervisor. Analysis demonstrated that the supervisee response to such reference could be organized into four themes, and the resulting pattern of interaction could also be characterized across the supervision process in four ways.

Supervisor initiation

In every beginning session, the issue of social identity was always brought up by the supervisor. This occurred in all eight beginning supervision sessions, regardless of supervisor or supervisee gender and ethnicity variables. Supervisor initiation occurred in one of two ways; supervisee introductory exploration and eliciting client description

Supervisee introductory exploration. Among a cluster of supervisors, the issue was first brought up while exploring the supervisee's style. A typical example of this sort of initiation was the introductory question, "Tell me about your counseling style...how does who you are influence your counseling style?" Supervisors who initiated in this way tended to have beginning sessions that were highly structured, somewhat didactic in their approach, and eliciting information from the supervisee. When supervisees responded to such a question they would invariably respond with characteristics of personality rather than identity. Thus, a typical response might be, "Well, I like listening to people and I guess, that's what I do in counseling."

Eliciting client description. The second type of supervisor initiation occurred in reference to specific clients. In every case, when a supervisee first discussed a client in supervision, other than a reference to the client's gender, none initiated even a reference to the client's ethnicity. This was regardless of whether the client in question was of European, African, Latino, Asian, or Native American origin. It was up to the supervisor to ask about the client's ethnic identity and usually supervisors eventually did. The only times a supervisor did not ask the client's ethnic identity, was when the supervisee was describing crisis events. The only information regarding client identify that might be referred to by a supervisee was disability. However, even in these instances, the disability was not raised as an area of exploration but more as a categorization of the client ("Oh, he's one of the special ed kids...I think he's ADD.")

The pattern of supervisor initiation of diversity issues continued throughout the supervision relationship. Regardless of prior discussions in previous sessions, supervisees would rarely do more than give ethnicity or age labels in later supervision sessions when describing a client. If a supervisor investigated such description ("How do you think it might be a factor, you said he was acting out, that he's a fourteen year old Black male in a predominantly White school?"), there might be discussion, often extended, but initiation by supervisees was markedly absent at any stage in supervision.

Supervisee Responses

When a supervisor initiated a reference to multicultural issues, the immediate supervisee response could be characterized in one of four ways; resistance, dismissal, elaboration, or exploration. The first two sets of responses were more characteristic of

beginning supervision sessions while later supervision sessions had more instances of the latter categories. Responses of resistance and dismissal were also more characteristic of discussions that centered primarily around race, ethnicity and sexual orientation, while exploration and elaboration were more typical responses to issues of gender, religion or disability.

Resistance. This category was based on supervisee responses that actively denied the significance of multicultural issues, especially in terms of the supervisee. An Asian Indian female supervisor elicited a response of self-labeling with a denial of reflection from a European-American female supervisee("Well, I guess I'm white, but I don't think I treat people differently."), while a European American female supervisor would get a more complicitous but similarly shallow response ("You know, I can't say it makes as much difference as [Professor X, the instructor for the multicultural counseling class] says. I mean, sometimes I want to argue that I've always gotten along with people, regardless of the color of their skin."). In the case of the supervisor asking about client description ("Perhaps she mentioned this, something about who she is, you know..."), a European-American female supervisee responded that she thought asking about ethnicity and so on was "way too advanced" for clients ("I don't ask them that kind of stuff, what would they say").

Dismissal. This response often occurred in situations where a supervisor sought client description, especially about clients who were European-American. Thematically different from resistance, there was little sense of discomfort in the supervisee response. Typically, this occurred around the discussion of clients who were European American. Supervisees would simply not see the relevance of multiculturalism in these instances. Another instance occurred around socioeconomic class, where when the supervisor

suggested that class issues might be a factor in low expectations of a client, the supervisee responded dismissively ("Oh, he's okay, I mean he can get okay grades, its more that the math and science teachers are more concrete; that's just the way they are in their expectations.")

Elaboration. Responses in this category tended to cluster around client social identity issues of religion or disability. Supervisees were more willing to elaborate on a client's disability, going into some detail about the diagnosis and prognosis. In one instance, when a supervisor asked regarding a client's religious beliefs, the supervisee described in detail the client's minority group religion and how she knew little about it. She acknowledged that such lack of knowledge might be widespread in the site, and might have an impact on the client's feelings of belonging. ("...that was my automatic reaction as soon as he said he was Mormon...all I know about it is from like TV and stuff, the ads that you see...)

Exploration. This thematic category organized responses that went beyond detail of the client into self-reflection on the part of the supervisee. The supervisee responses in this category that occurred during beginning supervision sessions were primarily from the African-American or Asian supervisee. While the immediate response might be as brief as in the dismissal category, the character of the response seemed more cautious than shallow ("I've been wondering if it will make a difference to clients, you know, there are a couple of kids who don't seem to want to talk with me and...well, I wonder."). In later supervision sessions, European American supervisees who reacted earlier with resistance or elaboration, were more likely to engage in exploration given particular patterns of interaction as described in the next section.

Supervisor -Supervisee patterns of interaction

Following the supervisor initiation and supervisee response, the patterns of interaction could be organized into four themes; indirect pursuit by the supervisor, direct confrontation, engagement and finally, disengagement. These thematic categories were not independent of each other, or of the responses of the supervisee. So, a pattern of direct confrontation in the beginning of supervision might well end up as engagement towards the end of supervision.

Indirect Pursuit. This pattern of interaction began where the typically European-American female supervisee either resisted or dismissed the supervisor's initial reference. The supervisors in this pattern, were both Asian Indian and European-American and female. In this pattern, the supervisee's initial negative response would be followed by a dropping of the subject. Future interactions tended to be similar replayings. The supervisor would ask about the client's social identity, the supervisee would respond dismissively and the supervisor would allow the dismissal. The supervisor would demonstrate interest in issues of multiculturalism, but would allow the supervisee to "get away" from the topic.

Direct Confrontation. Here, the supervisee's nascent response would be followed by a direct question. The question could be in reference to the supervisee's identity, where a supervisor continued to probe, and explicitly made clear that he or she was interested in identity ("How does your being a woman, say, or being White, influence how you would, you know, work with people?"). On the other hand, it could be addressed towards the supervisee's perceptions of the supervisory relationship with regard to exploration of identity issues ("Did you find it too challenging last time? Did you feel okay about what we talked about? I mean, we processed a lot..."). Finally, direct confrontation could occur in

addressing the supervisee's work with a client. For instance, in regard to a client with a learning disability who the supervisee had characterized as lazy, the supervisor confronted that perception directly ("Its real common for students with learning disabilities to be labeled as not working up to their potential, or its real easy to fall into that.") and directed the supervisee to do more exploration of the issue with the client. ("I think you need to go into more like how he feels about the labels he's been given, you know, being in resource and all that.") This ease was very much in contrast to an earlier discussion by the same pair regarding race.

Engagement. This was the most complex of the emerged categories, and was often linked to a positive response to direct confrontation. If direct confrontation was successful, engagement often resulted. It was most obvious towards the end of the supervision relationship. Initially resistant supervisees tended not to be engaged, but formerly dismissive supervisees became more self-reflective. Interestingly, the engagement often occurred around working with a client who was problematic for the supervisee. Typically, the supervisee would relate difficulties and the supervisor rewarded supervisee risk in disclosing doubts with their own self-disclosure and empathic responses. (For instance, a supervisor responded to supervisee feelings of not being on track with the self-disclosure, "Sometimes I'll do that too, you know, think of something three sessions later and go, wait a minute, what did that mean?"). Engagement was also characterized by interactions where the supervisee would comment on the supervisor's style and the supervisor would respond openly and positively ("Yes, I do try to offer constructive criticism, but you know, it only works because you bring up the tough stuff so we can, you know, deal with it."). Supervisors could also

move from one of the other categories into this pattern of interaction, so that a preliminary indirect pursuit pattern could turn into engagement.

Disengagement. In one supervision relationship, initial supervisee elaboration was followed by what appeared to be silence and then a change of subject on the part of the supervisor. In no future session did the relationship appear to go beyond a somewhat didactic processing of information regarding clients ("Ethnicity?" "I guess, African-American probably. I didn't really ask." "Okay, go on then."). In this pattern, there was a lack of personal reflection or disclosure of such reflection and the tone of the relationship appeared to be best characterized as disengaged. Both supervisor and supervisee were European American men.

Domains of diversity discussions

The raising of diversity issues were clearly focused in two dimensions. First, the discussion primarily centered on clients, often consisting of exploring how issues of identity might frame and shape individual clients. Sometimes, this would lead to a discussion of the supervisee's work with the client. The second area of discussion was the supervisee and his or her social identity. This predominantly arose in discussion of a client who differed from the supervisee along some dimension of social identity.

Areas where diversity issues could arise but rarely did, included both the influence of diversity issues on the supervisory relationship, as well as the supervisors' social identity. Such interactions occurred only in final supervision sessions, when the participants were engaged in a retrospective reflection on the supervision experience, or the supervisee and supervisor were speaking collegially. Collegial interactions occurred in the most depth between the African American and Asian Indian female supervisors and their supervisees

who were from ethnic minority groups. It is interesting, since these supervisors tended to have the most structured and didactic beginning supervision sessions. Those supervision relationships that were primarily characterized by resistant or dismissive supervisee responses and indirect supervisor pursuit or disengaged patterns of interaction, tended to have the same flow throughout the sessions. Supervision relationships characterized by direct confrontation and engagement, and supervisee responses of elaboration or exploration, seemed to end in greater depth of self-disclosure, self-reflection, and more instances of supervisor self-disclosure in general. Supervisees in final sessions often referred to moments of being challenged as difficult moments that in retrospect were growth producing.

Discussion

The results of this study show a complex interaction between supervisors and supervisees around diversity issues. Unlike the clearly delineated stage theories of counselor supervision, these findings depict a shifting interaction that is affected by both participants. Supervisors were not consistently engaged in any one pattern of interaction with all supervisees and it seems clear the supervisee was a significant part of the picture.

The limitations of this study are based in the absence of depictions of supervisory relationships where the supervisors were men of ethnic minority identity. In addition, the necessarily small pool of participants and qualitative discovery focus gave depth to the interaction patterns that emerged, but could not give breadth or clearly delineate categories and stages as is possible with a more quantitative approach.

The supervisor initiation of multicultural issues is particularly striking because all of the supervisees were concurrently taking a multicultural counseling class, so therefore they

were being exposed to discussion of such issues, and presumably an understanding of their importance. This dynamic may have much to do with the unequal nature of distribution of power and status within the supervisory relationship (Newman, 1981), especially given the beginning stages of these supervisees. They may well have been waiting for the supervisor to define the parameters of this novel relationship. In addition, regardless of their academic learning about multicultural issues, there may well have been hesitation, even among those supervisees predisposed developmentally or in terms of identity to discuss the issues. Given the still predominant learning of the traditional individually-based counseling theories, raising the specter of diversity issues is still a risk of being designated as radical; one that fledgling counselors are probably unwilling to take.

A related issue is that while there has been discussion that supervisors may be unversed in multicultural issues and therefore discourage discussion (Constantine, 1997; Priest, 1994), the supervisors in this research all addressed the issues. Given that they were all aware of the nature of the research focus, such addressing may not be surprising. However, the lack of any guidance from models of multicultural supervision was also obvious, in the haphazard ways in which the issues were addressed. This is especially significant given the importance of the practicum experience in the development of beginning counselors. Supervision is where such counselors-in-training begin to make sense of clinical data and learn case conceptualization. Incorporating multicultural issues systematically into such conceptualization is of paramount significance.

Academic learning in courses, unless linked with a laboratory or field experience component, does not appear to transfer easily to beginning counselors' approaches to conceptualizing clients. Multicultural counseling courses may need to have such

components, or practicum experiences may need built in requirements for diverse client counseling experiences. Regardless of Bernard's (1994) protest, supervision and training issues are inextricably intertwined. Her point regarding the time-limited duration of supervision and resultant shortcomings as an experiential modality for training in multicultural competency is clearly demonstrated in this study. Perhaps the answer lies in more such experiences as opposed to relegating them to academic coursework. Being explicitly encouraged to work with diverse clients and to reflect critically on the experience in supervision, may emphasize the importance of such issues and their application.

It may also be necessary to explicitly link supervision to training and counselor development in regards to the issue of multicultural awareness and skill development. This study demonstrates that the often resistant or dismissive initial response of supervisees to these issues, coupled with the novel and often threatening supervision relationship, may make it unfeasible to expect trainees to start self-reflection on issues of identity in beginning stages of practicum supervision. Instead, self-reflection and risk-taking should be familiar processes, begun before the trainee counselor is confronted by the stress of the practicum experience and the supervision process. Invitations to awareness by supervisors may be resisted less vehemently if they are familiar to the supervisee from other learning experiences.

Any stage model of multicultural supervision such as Vasquez and McKinley's (1982) three stage model, would need to take into consideration both the time frame of training as well as attend to both the supervisor and supervisee development. One supervision experience cannot be the sole vehicle for moving a supervisee through beginning

awareness to multicultural expertise. An initial field experience, a practicum under supervision, and later internship experiences may all need to be stages along the way.

Reflection on issues of identity is inherently disturbing since it opens up previously unquestioned frames of viewing the world. Confronting clients from backgrounds that are strange, identities that are different, and experiences that are disturbing, is unsettling enough. For the practicum counselor, the urge to demonstrate competency or at least avoid ineptness is primary (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). Enough anxiety floats around without adding that of the supervisor. A supervisor's discomfort or unfamiliarity with multicultural issues will have an enormous impact on the addressing of such issues in supervision, since the supervisor clearly sets the stage. Adeptness in multicultural counseling does not necessarily translate into skilled supervision around such issues. It is similar to the finding that a clinically skilled practitioner does not necessarily make an equally skilled supervisor (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992). Since Practicum supervisees need to feel supported and competent, too much challenge from the supervisor may lead to a shut down on the part of the supervisee, rather than the desired growth.

Finally, it appears that issues of race and ethnicity, and issues of sexual orientation carry a far greater element of tension than do issues of gender, disability or religion for those supervisees who do not belong to minority groups. Disability can be discussed in terms that locate the disability in the client, leading to little self-reflection among temporarily able-bodied counselors. There is a well-established literature on the ways in which gender affects development and perspective (Hyde, 1991) which has not been explicitly linked to power relations in society between gendered groups. This may make raising gender issues less threatening. That the response of supervisees is more likely to be resistant when race and

ethnicity issues are raised, indicates that beginning counselors perceive a greater potential for risk or disturbance of self-concept in discussing such issues. Self-reflection and awareness building should be critically emphasized in multicultural counseling courses, to empower students to address the impact of these issues in themselves as well as their clients.

Until diversity issues are integrated into the heart of counselor education, an essential part of every course and every field experience rather than a footnote, supervision will struggle to introduce such issues to the beginning counselor. Beginning counselors, in turn, will be ill-prepared to serve clients or fulfill the expectations of their chosen profession to embrace "a cross-cultural approach in support of the worth, dignity, potential, and uniqueness of each individual." (ACA, 1995).

References

American Counseling Association (1995). The ACA Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice. In B. Herlihy & G. Corey (Eds.) ACA Ethical Standards Casebook. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association, 27-59.

Arredondo, P. (1998). Integrating multicultural competencies and universal helping conditiona in culture-specific contexts. The Counseling Psychologist, 26(4), 592-602.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Interest Group (1995). Ethical guidelines for counseling supervisors. Counselor Education & Supervision, 34(3), 270-276.

Bernard, J. M. (1997). The Discrimination model. In C. Edward Watkins (Ed.), Handbook of Psychotherapy Supervision, New York: John Wiley & Sons. 310-327.

Bernard, J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (1998). Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bernard, J. (1994). Multicultural supervision: A reaction to Leong and Wagner, Cook, Priest, and Fukuyama. Counselor Education & Supervision, 34(2), 159-171.

Constantine, M. G. (1997). Facilitating multicultural competency in counseling supervision: Operationalizing a practical framework. In D. Pope-Davis & H. Coleman (Eds.) Multicultural Counseling Competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 310-324.

Cook, D. A. (1994). Racial identity in supervision. Counselor Education & Supervision, 34(2), 132-141.

Cook, D. A. & Helms, J. E. (1988). Visible racial/ethnic group supervisees' satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision as predicted by relationship characteristics. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35(3), 268-274.

D'Andrea, M & Daniels, J. (1997). Multicultural counseling supervision: Central issues, theoretical considerations, and practical strategies. In D. Pope-Davis & H. Coleman (Eds.) Multicultural Counseling Competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 290-309.

Fong, M. L. (1994). Multicultural issues in supervision. ERIC Digest. (ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services No.CG025748).

Fukuyama, M. A. (1994). Critical incidents in multicultural counseling supervision: A phenomenological approach to supervision research. Counselor Education & Supervision, 34(2), 142-151.

Goodyear , R. K. & Bernard, J. M. (1998). Clinical supervision: Lessons from the literature. Counselor Education & Supervision, 38(1), 6-22.

Hilton, D. B., Russell, R. K., & Salmi, S. W. (1995). The effects of supervisor race and level of support on perceptions of supervision. Journal of Counseling & Development, 73(5), 559-563.

Holloway, E. L. & Hosford, R. E. (1983). Towards developing a prescriptive technology of counselor supervision. The Counseling Psychologist, 11, 73-77.

Hyde, J. S. (1991). Half the human experience: The psychology of women (4th Edition). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Leong, F. T. (1994). Emergence of the cultural dimension: The roles and impact of culture on counseling supervision. Counselor Education & Supervision, 34(2), 114-116.

Leong, F. T. & Wagner, N. S. (1994). Cross-cultural counseling supervision: What do we know? What do we need to know? Counselor Education & Supervision, 34(2), 117-131.

Lopez, S. R. (1997). Cultural competence in psychotherapy: A guide for clinicians and their supervisors. In C. Edward Watkins (Ed.), Handbook of Psychotherapy Supervision, New York: John Wiley & Sons. 570- 588.

National Board of Certified Counselors, Inc. (1998, July 31). Standards for the ethical practice of clinical supervision. Greensboro, NC: NBCC. Retrieved October 2000, from the World Wide Web: http://www.nbcc.org/acs/standards.htm.

Newman, A. S. (1981). Ethical issues in the supervision of psychotherapy. Professional Psychology, 12, 690-695.

Priest, R. (1994). Minority supervisor and majority supervisee: Another perspective of clinical reality. Counselor Education & Supervision, 34(2), 152-158.

Russell, R. K. & Petrie, T. (1994). Issues in training effective supervisors. Applied and Preventive Psychology, 3, 27-42.

Stone, G. L. (1997). Multiculturalism as a context for supervision: Perspectives, limitations, and implications. In D. Pope-Davis & H. Coleman (Eds.) Multicultural Counseling Competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 263-289.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Vasquez, M. J. T. & McKinley, D. L. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model: Reactions and an extension. The Counseling Psychologist, 10(1), 59-63.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: DIVERSITY ISSUES IN THE CLINICAL SUPERVISION OF PRACTICUM STUDENTS : A THEMATIC ANALYSIS	
Author(s): DEVIKA DIBYA CHOUDHURI	
Corporate Source: PAPER PRESENTED AT THE ASSOC. OF COUNSELOR EDUCATORS & SUPERVISORS NATIONAL CONVENCE	Publication Date: 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ☒ Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Level 2A ☐ Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Level 2B ☐ Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: D Choudhuri	Printed Name/Position/Title: DIBYA CHOUDHURI, ASSISTANT PROF	
Organization/Address: DEPT. OF LEADERSHIP & COUNSELING 304 PORTER BLDG., EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY YPSILANTI, MI 48197	Telephone: (734) 487-0255	FAX: 734-487-4608
	E-Mail Address: dibya.choudhuri@emich.edu	Date: 2/6/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)